



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/758,199

01/16/2004

Gagan Puranik

SKY03009

4894

25537 7590 03/24/2008

VERIZON  
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP  
1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 500  
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MINH DIEU T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/24/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/758,199	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PURANIK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MINH DIEU NGUYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 20-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-19 and 28-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 20-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This office action is in response to the communication dated 12/20/2007.
2. Claims 1-8 and 20-27 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argues that Moles does not mention a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server. The examiner respectfully disagrees, Moles discloses provisioning server has the key to the encryption algorithm used by base station, provisioning server is able to process legitimate service provisioning requests from mobile station, as such provisioning server is a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server (Moles: col. 10, lines 5-8).

### ***Drawings***

4. The objection of the drawing has been withdrawn based on the filed amendment.

### ***Specification***

5. The objection of the specification has been withdrawn based on the filed amendment.

### ***Claim Objections***

6. The objections of claims 1-2, 6-8, 20-21 and 25-27 have been withdrawn based on the filed amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3-8, 20 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farley et al. (2006/0018293) in view of Moles et al. (7,024,557).

a) As to claim 1, Farley discloses a method for secure message reception from a plurality of remote devices (Farley: 0002) comprising: receiving a message at a controller (i.e. messages from remotes devices are supported by base station, Farley: 0051); obtaining, by the controller, a reverse channel address associated with the received message (i.e. traffic channel in the reverse link carry payload data, Farley: 0056); determining, by the controller, whether the received message is associated with at least one of the remote devices (Farley: 0112); forwarding the message and the reverse channel address when the message is associated with the at least one of the remote devices; determining a destination address for the received message based on the reverse channel address and routing the received message to the destination address (i.e. a message A is bound for server through JACK channel 54 (i.e. reverse

link), base station identifies the destination address and forward the network message accordingly, Farley: Fig. 7; 0094-0098).

Although Farley discloses forwarding the message and the reverse channel address and determining a destination address for the received message, Farley does not explicitly disclose those steps are done by the routing server.

Moles is relied on for the teaching of having the routing server structure (i.e. base stations are operable to communicate with a plurality of mobile stations, base stations transfer voice and data signals between each other and mobile switching center, where the mobile switching center is a switching device that provides services and coordination between the subscribers, Moles: col. 5, lines 43-49; col. 6, lines 13-21, Fig. 1). Moles also discloses the controller is disposed in a mobile switching center or may be disposed in an interworking function unit or may be partitioned between the mobile switching center and the interworking function unit (Moles: col. 4, lines 7-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of having the routing server structure in the system of Farley, as Moles teaches, so as to effectively transfer services between subscribers (Moles: col. 6, lines 18-21).

b) As to claim 20, this claim is a hardware implementation of the method of claim 1, and is rejected by the same rationale applied against claim 1.

c) As to claim 3, the combination of Farley and Moles discloses the method of claim 1 wherein determining whether the received message is associated with at

least one of the remote devices further comprises reviewing header information in the received message (Farley: 0094).

d) As to claim 22, this claim is a hardware implementation of the method of claim 3, and is rejected by the same rationale applied against claim 3.

e) As to claim 4, the combination of Farley and Moles discloses the method of claim 3, wherein determining the destination address further comprises retrieving a remote device profile based upon the obtained reverse channel address (i.e. based on the JACK channel, the subscriber ID is retrieved, Farley: 0119).

f) As to claim 23, this claim is a hardware implementation of the method of claim 4, and is rejected by the same rationale applied against claim 4.

g) As to claim 5, the combination of Farley and Moles discloses the method of claim 4, wherein determining the destination address comprises obtaining the destination address from a remote device (i.e. JACK channel is assigned for use by a subscriber unit, the destination address is received from the device, Farley: 0127).

h) As to claim 24, this claim is a hardware implementation of the method of claim 5, and is rejected by the same rationale applied against claim 5.

i) As to claims 6-8, the combination of Farley and Moles discloses the method of claim 1, wherein determining the destination address further comprises determining whether the received message is associated with a remote device that is associated with a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server (Moles: col. 8, line 59 to col. 9, line 8), wherein the received message is routed to the hosted crypto server

and to the enterprise crypto server (i.e. provisioning server, Moles: col. 9, lines 6-8; lines 19-22).

j) As to claims 25-27, these claims are hardware implementation of the method of claims 6-8, respectively, and are rejected by the same rationale applied against claims 6-8.

9. Claims 2 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farley et al. (2006/0018293) in view of Moles et al. (7,024,557) and further in view of Bims et al. (6,259,911).

a) As to claim 2, the combination of Farley and Moles discloses the method of claim 1, however it is silent on the communications protocol employed to transmit the received message is ReFLEX protocol.

Bims is relied on for the teaching of having the communications protocol employed to transmit the received message is ReFLEX protocol (Bims: col. 1, lines 13-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of having the communications protocol employed to transmit the received message is ReFLEX protocol in the system of Farley and Moles, as Bims teaches so as to provide an effective means for enabling wireless communications.

b) As to claim 21, this claim is hardware implementation of the method of claim 2, and is rejected by the same rationale applied against claim 2.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dieu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3873.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Minh Dieu Nguyen/  
Temporary Full Signatory, Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2137  
3/28/08